

On Fueling Gamma-Ray Bursts and Their Afterglows with Pulsars

Eric G. Blackman¹ and Insu Yi²

¹Institute of Astronomy, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, England;
blackman@ast.cam.ac.uk

²Institute for Advanced Study, Olden Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540; yi@sns.ias.edu

(submitted to ApJL)

ABSTRACT

Cosmological gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) and their afterglows seem to result from dissipation of bulk energy in relativistic outflows, but their engine has not been unambiguously identified. The engine could be a young pulsar formed from accretion induced collapse with a dynamo amplified field. Elsewhere, we suggest that such a “Usov type” strong field pulsar may help explain the bimodal distribution in GRB durations. Here we discuss possible roles of a pulsar for the afterglow. We derive the expected bolometric luminosity decay. The extracted rotational energy could dissipate by shocks or by large amplitude electromagnetic waves (LAEMW). The simplest LAEMW approach predicts a slower decay in observed afterglow peak frequency and faster decay in flux than the simplest blast-wave model, though more complicated models of both can provide different dependences. LAEMW do not require the rapid magnetic field amplification demanded of the blast-wave approach because the emission originates from a nearly fixed radius. Different time dependent behavior of GRB and post-GRB emission is also predicted. Observational evidence for a pulsar in a GRB would make some GRB engine models, such as neutron star mergers and black holes unlikely. Therefore, the question of whether a pulsar is present is an important one even if it could drive a canonical fireball.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts; pulsars: general; stars: magnetic fields

1. Introduction

Gamma-ray bursts (GRB) and their afterglows are likely the result of energy dissipation from a relativistically expanding outflow (e.g. Rees 1997a). Recent observations of GRB and their afterglows in optical and radio require a total GRB energy output $\sim 10^{52} \Delta\Phi$ erg where $\Delta\Phi$ is the solid angle fraction for the opening of the outflow from which emission occurs (e.g. Waxman et al.

1997, Dar 1997, and references therein). The observation of an intervening absorber at redshift of 0.835 (Metzger et al. 1997) in GRB 970508, suggests that this burst, if not all, are cosmological. Although cosmological fireball+blast-wave models provide somewhat successful fits to the GRB and afterglow emission (e.g. Wijers et al. 1997, Waxman 1997, Katz & Piran 1997), the engine driving the outflow is unknown. This gives GRB a unique place in modern astronomy as the only known source whose engine does not yet point to a convincing paradigm. Even the energy budget is not fully constrained since the extent of beaming is unknown (e.g. Rhoads 1997).

Magnetic fields are essential to GRB emission and afterglows in most viable models. Two paradigms for the GRB and/or the afterglow can be distinguished (e.g. Katz & Piran 1997). In the first, emission results from dissipation in an out-flowing fireball and magnetized blast-wave interacting with the external medium, “external shock model.” In the second, energy is transferred into particles well internal to the interface between the outflow and the ambient medium. Internal shock models are an example of the latter but the class is better described just by “internal” since shocks are not necessarily required. It appears that external models are not at work for the actual GRB, but may be fundamental for the afterglow. Whether internal processes may account for both is unknown. One example of a “non-shock” internal process is large amplitude electromagnetic waves (LAEMW), which can extract rotational energy (e.g. Michel 1984, Usov 1994) from strongly magnetized, millisecond (or sub-millisecond) pulsars (MSP) and can be applied to GRB.

Several pulsar or compact object models (e.g. Usov 1992, Thompson 1994, Blackman et al. 1996, Kluzniak & Ruderman 1997; Meszaros & Rees 1997, Yi & Blackman 1998) share the feature that power is first extracted in the form of Poynting flux and is later converted to gamma-rays and lower frequency photons. Since the Poynting flux energizes particles at large distances from the magnetized rotator, the required low baryon fraction (e.g. Fenimore et al. 1993) is maintained, and the gamma-ray transparency condition on the bulk Lorentz factor of the relativistic outflow ($\gamma > 100$) is ensured. The Poynting flux extraction of Meszaros & Rees (1997) comes from a rotating black hole+torus engine, so the extraction is transient, lasting until the torus falls into the hole (tens of seconds), not throughout the afterglow, like a pulsar.

Pulsars formed from accretion induced collapse (AIC), with a dynamo amplified field, are appealing for GRB because two classes of such bursts can result, depending on whether or not the initial pulsar forms with spin above or below the gravitationally unstable limit (Usov 1992). We have suggested elsewhere (Blackman et al. 1996, Yi & Blackman 1998, cf. Katz & Canel 1996) that these two classes might account for the bimodal duration distribution (e.g. Kouveliotou et al. 1993). The pulsar also provides an alternative to explain the GRB afterglows. Also, pulsar LAEMW emission mechanisms exist which do not require the amplification of magnetic field required in blast-wave shock models.

We emphasize that even though the presence of a pulsar may be fundamental, the actual mechanism by which the pulsar ultimately transfers its energy into radiation is not well understood.

If a blast-wave is produced, the result may be very similar to transient rotator models (e.g. Meszaros & Rees 1997) formed from neutron star mergers (e.g. Narayan et al. 1992). But if observational evidence for a pulsar is found, GRB would probably *not* be the result of neutron star mergers since the compact object formed is likely too large to be a neutron star (Ruffert et al. 1997). The question of a pulsar presence is thus extremely important.

In this paper we first summarize an AIC (cf. Yi & Blackman 1998; also see Dar et al. 1992, Thompson 1994) pulsar model. We then discuss how the electromagnetic energy might dissipate. We calculate features of an LAEMW afterglow and compare to the external shock fireball. We then conclude, suggesting features that could help indicate a pulsar presence.

2. Pulsar Model and Bolometric Luminosity Evolution

When a white dwarf reaches the critical Chandrasekhar mass $\sim 1.4M_{\odot}$ through mass accretion, it collapses to a neutron star. The probable mass accretion rate leading to AIC is $\dot{M} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{18} g/s$ (e.g. Livio & Truran 1992), and lasts for $> 10^6 yr$. (Such constraints disfavor binary systems where the secondary is also a white dwarf.) For a pre-AIC white dwarf with moment of inertia $I_{wd} = 10^{51} gcm^2$ and radius $R_{wd} = 10^9 cm$, the magnetic field B_{wd} and spin frequency Ω_{wd} are related to the post-AIC pulsar spin frequency and magnetic field by $\Omega_{wd} = \Omega_*(I_*/I_{wd})$ and $B_{wd} = B_*(R_*/R_{wd})^2$ where $I_* = 10^{45} gcm^2$ and $R_* = 10^6 cm$ are the moment of inertia and the radius of the MSP. In order to create a MSP ($\Omega_* \sim 10^4 s^{-1}$) with $B_* \sim 10^{15} G$ by flux-freezing, the pre-collapse white dwarf must have $\Omega_{wd} \sim 10^{-2} s$ and $B_{wd} \sim 10^9 G$. Such strong white dwarf fields have not been observed. Moreover, Yi & Blackman (1998) have shown that such AIC inducing magnetized accretion is not compatible with such a white dwarf. They find that the most likely AIC-produced MSP parameters satisfy $\Omega_* \sim 10^4 B_{*,11}^{-4/5} s^{-1}$ where $B_{*,11} = B_*/10^{11} G$.

But field amplification is natural in the early phases of the neutron star, either linearly by differential rotation (Kluźniak & Ruderman 1997) or exponentially by dynamo amplification (Duncan & Thompson 1992). The dynamo would undoubtedly be the more efficient mode if operating. In the Kluźniak & Ruderman (1997) approach (which could in principle be applied to any magnetized rotator) the growth of magnetic field from differential rotation leads to intermittent expulsion of field from the pulsar, possibly accounting for the spiky light curves of GRB. This requires linear magnetic field growth rather than (dynamo) exponential, otherwise the expulsions would be too rapid.

Duncan & Thompson (1997) suggested that a young hot MSP is a favorable site for an $\alpha\omega$ dynamo due to vigorous convection driven by a large neutrino flux. The dynamo efficiency can be estimated by the Rossby number $N_R = P_*/\tau_{conv}$, where $P_* = 2\pi/\Omega_*$ is the MSP spin period and τ_{conv} is the convective overturn time scale at the base of the convection zone. If $N_R \lesssim 1$ in a turbulent medium, an efficient dynamo can result. Duncan and Thompson (1992) give the

convective overturn time as $\tau_{conv} \sim 10^{-3} F_{39}^{-1/3} s$ where F_{39} is the convective neutrino heat flux in units of $10^{39} \text{ erg/s/cm}^2$. They show that a $\sim 10^{15} G$ large scale field can be produced.

The total luminosity emitted from the young pulsar has two important terms. An electromagnetic (EM) term and a gravitational radiation (GR) term. When the initial pulsar spin exceeds a critical spin Ω_{crit} , the GR luminosity term can dominate (e.g. Usov 1992). For a young and highly viscous pulsar, the GR drain does not have time to change the star's moment of inertia (Yi & Blackman 1998), so GR proceeds through spin-down, and the pulsar follows the track of an unstable Maclaurin spheroid (e.g. Chandrasekhar 1969). This means that the EM luminosity is depleted on the spin-down time scale, enabling the AIC-pulsar model to account for the bimodality of GRB durations (Blackman et al, 1996; Yi & Blackman 1998, however, cf. Katz & Canel 1996). If the young NS initially followed the Jacobi rather than Maclaurin track, it would instead spin up, and would not naturally lead to a bimodal distribution. However, the GR from these two paths may be measurably distinguishable (Lai & Shapiro 1995).

Assuming $\Omega_{crit} > \Omega_{dynamo}$, where Ω_{dynamo} is the spin required for dynamo action, there are two types of pulsars which can form GRB: [1] Supercritical strong field rotator (SPS) with $\Omega_* > \Omega_{crit} > \Omega_{dynamo}$, and [2] Subcritical strong field rotators (SBS) $\Omega_{crit} > \Omega_* > \Omega_{dynamo}$. Since these classes have similar rotational frequencies, they likely originate from similar pre-collapse conditions so the numbers of the two classes should be similar. The EM luminosity available for particles (quadrupole may also be important) is

$$L_{obs} = f L_{em} \sim 10^{51} (f/0.1) (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1} (\Omega_*/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 (R_*/10^6 \text{ cm})^6 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 \text{ erg/s}, \quad (2-1)$$

where f is the efficiency. The luminosity from GR is given by

$$L_{gw} = 32G\epsilon^2 I_*^2 \Omega_*^6 / 5c^5 = 7 \times 10^{55} (M_*/M_\odot) (R_*/10^6 \text{ cm})^4 (\Omega_*/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^6 \epsilon^2 \text{ erg/s}, \quad (2-2)$$

where ϵ is the eccentricity. Both SPS and SBS emit EM radiation. However for SPS, the spin-down, and hence the luminosity e-folding decrease, occurs on a time scale $\tau_{gw} \lesssim 1s$ whereas in SBS, the spin-down and luminosity decrease occur on a time scale $\tau_{em} \sim 10^2 s$. SPS may be naturally related to the short GRB bursts and SBS to long bursts of the observed (Kouveliotou et al. 1993) bimodal duration distribution.

Using (2-1) and (2-2), we can solve for the time evolution of the PSR spin for L_{gw} and L_{em} dominated regimes respectively. Setting the kinetic energy loss $L_{kin} = (1/2) M_* R_*^2 \Omega_* (d\Omega_*/dt)$ equal to L_{gw} , we use (2-2) to solve for Ω_* . Separating variables and integrating gives

$$\Omega_* = 10^4 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}) [1 + 2.8 \times 10^3 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 (M_*/M_\odot) (R/10^6 \text{ cm})^2 \epsilon^2 ((t - t_0)/1s)]^{-1/4} \text{ s}^{-1}, \quad (2-3)$$

where $\Omega_0 = \Omega_*(t = t_0)$ is the spin rate of the initially formed pulsar at time $t = t_0$. At $t = t_{eq}$, the spin evolution for SPS bursts changes from being GR dominated to EM radiation dominated. This time is likely of order τ_{gw} since ϵ decreases rapidly after that, and L_{gw} becomes unimportant. For the SBS, the spin down is always dominated by L_{em} .

For the SBS bursts and for SPS bursts after t_{eq} , we set (2-1) equal to L_{kin} and integrate, so

$$\Omega_* = 10^4 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}) [1 + 2 \times 10^{-2} (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^2 (R/10^6 \text{ cm})^4 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 ((t - t_{0,em})/1 \text{ s})]^{-1/2} \text{ s}^{-1}. \quad (2-4)$$

where $t_{0,em}$ equals t_0 for the SBS or t_{eq} for the SPS.

By plugging (2-3) and (2-4) back into (2-1) we can find the observed bolometric luminosity time dependence for GRB and afterglow. For the GR dominated phase

$$L_{obs} \sim 10^{51} (f/0.1) (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1} (R_*/10^6 \text{ cm})^6 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 \quad (2-5)$$

$$\times [1 + 2.8 \times 10^3 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 (M_*/M_\odot) (R/10^6 \text{ cm})^2 \epsilon^2 ((t - t_0)/1 \text{ s})]^{-1} \text{ erg/s},$$

while for the EM dominated phase

$$L_{obs} \sim 10^{51} (f/0.1) (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1} (R_*/10^6 \text{ cm})^6 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 (\Omega_{0,em}/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 \quad (2-6)$$

$$\times [1 + 2 \times 10^{-2} (\Omega_{0,em}/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^2 (R/10^6 \text{ cm})^4 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 ((t - t_{0,em})/1 \text{ s})]^{-2} \text{ erg/s},$$

where $\Omega_{0,em}$ is the spin at the beginning of EM domination at $t = t_{0,em}$.

Note that in the very early phase of the SBS bursts, the spin-down driven emission remains approximately constant and does not begin to decay as a power law until the critical time $t \sim 50\text{s}$ from (2-6). Whereas for the SPS bursts, from (2-5), a t^{-1} decay occurs immediately, followed by a t^{-2} decay from the L_{em} dominated phase of (2-6). Thus SBS are in qualitative accordance with the data analysis of Fenimore (1997) in the sense that during the GRB the burst decays more slowly than in the subsequent afterglow. This is just an example of how the same internal process can account for different time evolutions of the burst and afterglow.

3. Peak Frequency and Associated Luminosity Evolution from LAEMW

The magnetic field in the pulsar engine acts as a drive belt, extracting energy as Poynting flux to a large distance where it is then converted into particles. (The magnetic field plays a similar role in the Meszaros & Rees (1997) model.) The extracted energy could subsequently dissipate in large amplitude electromagnetic waves or within a fireball+shock. How this energy is dissipated or converted into particles is not clear and may depend on the proton fraction of the outflow. If there is a negligible proton fraction, then LAEMW can propagate and accelerate pair plasma blobs (Asseo et al. 1978, Blackman et al. 1996). We discuss this and the associated afterglow below.

Avoiding the runaway pair production that would make a blob optically thick to gamma rays, requires $\gamma > 100$ (e.g. Krolik & Pier 1991). Such pair plasma blobs moving along the magnetic dipole axis with $\gamma > 10^4$ might be produced in PSR magnetospheres (Usov 1994) by the LAEMW.

The LAEMW propagate outside a radius, r_{ff} , where the density drops below that which can sustain a Goldreich-Julian (Goldreich & Julian 1969) charge density, and thus where flux-freezing and force-free conditions are broken. This gives (Usov 1994)

$$r_{ff} \sim 7.5 \times 10^{13} (f/0.1)^{1/4} (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1/4} (B_*/10^{15}G)^{1/2} (\Omega_*/10^4s^{-1})^{1/2} \text{ cm}, \quad (3-1)$$

where we have included the beaming. The associated pair plasma number density is

$$n_{ff} \sim 1.5 \times 10^8 (f/0.1)^{-3/4} (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{3/4} (R_*/10^6\text{cm}) (B_*/10^{15}G)^{1/2} (\Omega_*/10^4s^{-1})^{5/2} \text{ cm}^{-3}. \quad (3-2)$$

Electron acceleration at r_{ff} is characterized by σ_{ff} , defined by (Usov 1994; Michel 1984)

$$\sigma_{ff} \equiv L_{dip}/(mc^2 \dot{N}_{ff}) \sim 5.3 \times 10^7 (f/0.1)^{-3/4} (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{3/4} (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^5 (B_*/10^{15}G)^{1/2} (\Omega_*/10^4s^{-1})^{1/2}, \quad (3-3)$$

where $\dot{N}_{ff} = 4\pi r_{ff}^2 c n_{ff}$ is the electron flux and m_e is the electron mass. By solving the equations of motion for a particle in a pulsar wind zone subject to electromagnetic forces, it has been shown that relativistic electromagnetic waves of frequency Ω_* can accelerate pair plasma to (Michel 1984, Asseo et al. 1978) $\gamma \sim \sigma_{ff}^{2/3} \sim 10^6 (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^{10/3} (B_*/10^{15}G)^{1/3} (\Omega_*/10^4s^{-1})^{1/3}$, and the resulting emission is beamed within solid angle $\sim \gamma^{-2}$ from the direction of wave propagation (Asseo et al. 1978). The characteristic emitted frequency of the synchro-Compton radiation is (Michel 1984)

$$\nu_c \sim \ln(r_{ff}/R_*) \Omega_* \sigma_{ff}^2 \sim 5 \times 10^{20} (f/0.1)^{-3/2} (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{3/2} (\Omega_*/10^4s^{-1})^2 (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^{10} (B_*/10^{15}G) \text{ Hz}. \quad (3-4)$$

Using (3-4), (2-3) and (2-4), and assuming only Ω_* changes with time, we obtain different dependences of $\nu_c(t)$ for the GR and electromagnetic dominated phases. For the GR phase

$$\nu_c = \nu_{c0} [1 + 2.8 \times 10^3 (\nu_{c0}/5 \times 10^{20} \text{ Hz}) (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^{-18} (B_*/10^{15})^2 (M/M_\odot) \epsilon^2 ((t-t_0)/1s)]^{-1/2}, \quad (3-5)$$

where $\nu_{c0} = \nu_c(\Omega_* = \Omega_0)$, while for the electromagnetic dominated regime

$$\nu_c = \nu_{c0,em} [1 + 2 \times 10^{-2} (\nu_{c0,em}/5 \times 10^{20} \text{ Hz}) (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^{-9} (B_*/10^{15}) ((t-t_{0,em})/1s)]^{-1}, \quad (3-6)$$

where $\nu_{c0,em} = \nu_c(\Omega_* = \Omega_{0,em})$. Note that when (3-5) applies, the total emission is actually dominated by GR which peaks at 10-100 Hz (Lai & Shapiro 1995).

We can also compute the time decay of the luminosity (or flux) at the peak electromagnetic emission frequency ν_c . Assuming the form $L_\nu = L_{\nu_c} (\nu/\nu_c)^{-\alpha}$, with $\alpha > 1$, we have $L_{obs} \sim L_{\nu_c} \nu_c$. Using $L_{\nu_c} \sim \nu_c^{-1} L_{obs}$, and for the GR dominated phase using (3-4) and (3-5) in (2-1) we get

$$L_{\nu_c} \sim 10^{51} (f/0.1) (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1} (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^6 (B_*/10^{15}G)^2 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 \times [1 + 2.8 \times 10^3 (\Omega_0/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 (M_*/M_\odot) (R/10^6\text{cm})^2 \epsilon^2 ((t-t_0)/1s)]^{-1/2} \text{ erg/s}. \quad (3-7)$$

For the electromagnetic dominated phase using (3-4) and (3-6) in (2-1) we get

$$L_{\nu_c} \sim 10^{51} (f/0.1) (\Delta\Phi/0.01)^{-1} (R_*/10^6\text{cm})^6 (B_*/10^{15}G)^2 (\Omega_{0,em}/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^4 \quad (3-8)$$

$$\times [1 + 2 \times 10^{-2} (\Omega_{0,em}/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})^2 (R/10^6 \text{ cm})^4 (B_*/10^{15} \text{ G})^2 ((t - t_{0,em})/1 \text{ s})]^{-1} \text{ erg/s.}$$

The evolution of the critical frequency and associated luminosity is less certain than the evolution of the bolometric luminosity when the latter is directly related to pulsar spin-down. Nevertheless we can still speculate that the proton fraction in the outflow may be essential in determining what kind of dissipation occurs and the LAEMW case discussed above is most relevant when the outflow contains very few. Simulations of Hoshino et al. (1992) show that collisionless relativistic shocks produce a significant non-thermal lepton tail only when the protons comprise $> 5\%$ of the material. In the proton enriched case, shock acceleration of electrons might be the most likely GRB producing mechanism. The simplest fireball evolution (e.g. Waxman 1997) leads to a t^{-2} bolometric luminosity dependence, just like the LAEMW, but predicts $\nu_c \propto t^{-3/2}$ and $F_{\nu_c} \propto t^{-1/2}$. This does seem to be consistent with several afterglows (Wijers et al 1997; Waxman 1997).

The characteristic “smoothness” of the outflow Lorentz factor Γ may also be important in distinguishing what kind of dissipation occurs. For ejecta emitted at two different times with two different Γ satisfying $\Gamma_2 > \Gamma_1 \gg 1$, internal GRB producing shocks could form at an observer frame distance of $c|t_2 - t_1|\Gamma_1\Gamma_2$ (Rees & Meszaros 1994) and may dissipate the energy before other internal mechanisms like LAEMW acceleration occur.

4. Discussion

A generic afterglow may not clearly reveal the GRB engine, much like supernova remnant physics is disconnected from the physics of stellar collapse. A pulsar GRB engine could lead to a fireball or alternative acceleration mechanisms like LAEMW that dissipate a large fraction of EM energy before shocks form at a nearly fixed radius. One advantage of this LAEMW approach is that there is no need for the extremely rapid magnetic field amplification in the expanding outflow required of the fireball for both external and the internal shock models (e.g. Rees & Meszaros 1994): For LAEMW, the radius r_{ff} and density at which the particle acceleration and radiation can occur remains nearly constant while the characteristic emission frequency decreases from its sensitivity to pulsar spin down. Alternatively, the pulsar could also provide some of the required magnetic field, if its role were instead to generate a blast-wave.

The simplest LAEMW picture predicts slower afterglow critical frequency decays than a blast-wave. However, variations in the blast-wave models might lead to slower decays as it is not necessarily the case that most of the outflow energy is carried by the flow moving with the largest Lorentz factor (Rees & Mezaros 1997). To complicate things further, both blast-waves and LAEMW could result from pulsars. The proton fraction of the outflow may be important in determining the primary mode of particle acceleration and emission. In short, variations of energy dissipation mechanisms in strongly magnetized pulsar outflows could lead to a variety of critical frequency and peak flux evolutions. This makes it hard to distinguish between a pulsar engine vs. that of a transient Poynting flux extraction model.

However, whether a pulsar lies in GRB engines is important because the presence would be incompatible with the resulting compact object mass from neutron star merger models and neutron star equations of state (Ruffert et al. 1997). Evidence for pulsars in GRBs would threaten the merger paradigm. Several possibilities that could hint at a pulsar are: [1] The pulsar rotation itself may be a source of $\sim 10^{-3}s$. variability during the burst. For SBS (the longer) bursts, the characteristic time scale of variability after 50s or so from (2-6) goes as $\tau_v \propto \Omega_*^{-1} \propto t^{1/2}$. This trend may be measurable in X-rays. For SPS (the shorter) bursts, the trend is $\tau_v \propto \Omega_*^{-1} \propto t^{1/4}$, immediately, and then $\tau_v \propto \Omega_*^{-1} \propto t^{1/2}$ after τ_{gw} . [2] Future evidence in the radio band (Rees 1997b) like violent fluctuations or coherent emission (e.g. Melrose 1993). For GRB970508, the predicted bolometric luminosity from the t^{-2} decay after $t \sim 50$ days is about equal to that required of the radio afterglow luminosity for GRB970508 which is $L_{obs} \sim 10^{41}(\nu/5GHz)(F_\nu/10^{-26}\text{erg/s/cm}^2)(d/5Gpc)^2 \text{ erg/s}$ (Waxman et al. 1997): Using (2-6) for SBS, we have $L_{obs} \sim 10^{41} \text{ erg/s}$ at $t = 50$ days. However, the decreasing scintillation amplitude suggests radio source expansion (Goodman 1997, Waxman et al. 1997), so here any pulsar's role could have been mainly to drive a blast-wave, rather than LAEMW. [3] The SPS class of GRBs would be accompanied by GR absent from the longer SBS class. The detection of a significant GR excess from short GRBs would give support to an AIC pulsar engine model. The GR signature for various evolutionary tracks of secularly unstable AIC pulsars are unique and possibly measurable (Lai & Shapiro 1995). [4] The SPS bursts should show a t^{-1} decay in bolometric luminosity followed by a t^{-2} decay after the gamma-ray phase. The SBS bursts should show almost no decay during the bursts and then a t^{-2} decay after the GRB phase ends. This follows from (3-7) and (3-8). [5] Observations might reveal a faint residual pulsar or X-ray accreting source well after the optical afterglow fades. An AXAF view of an afterglow could be revealing.

Finally, the AIC rate for pulsar formation is unknown, but could be comparable to the local supernova rate, i.e. $10^{-2}yr^{-1}$ per galaxy, the observed GRB rate of $\sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-5}yr^{-1}$ per galaxy can be amply explained by the AIC model with modest beaming. These numbers are not inconsistent with the possibility that GRB signature *all* AIC events.

E.B. thanks M. Rees and R. Wijers for discussions and I. Y. acknowledges support from SUAM Foundation,

?? Asseo, E., Kennel, C.F. 1978, & Pellat,R., A.& A., 65, 401.

?? Blackman, E.G., Yi, I., & Field, G. B. 1996, ApJ, 473, L79

?? Chandrasekhar, S. 1969, Ellipsoidal Figures of Equilibrium (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press)

?? Dar, A. 1997, preprint (astro-ph/9709231)

?? Dar, A., Kozlovsky, B. Z., Nussinov, S., & Ramaty, R. 1992, ApJ, 388, 164

?? Duncan, R. C. & Thompson, C. 1992, ApJ, 392, L9

?? Fenimore, E.E., Epstein, R. I., & Ho, C. 1993, A&AS, 97, 59

- ?? Fenimore, E.E. 1997, submitted to ApJ.
- ?? Goldreich, P. & Julian, W. H. 1969, ApJ 157, 869.
- ?? Goodman, J, 1997, New Astronomy, 2, 449.
- ?? Hoshino, M. et al. 1992, ApJ, 390, 454.
- ?? Katz, J. I. & Canel, L. M. 1996, ApJ, 471, 915
- ?? Katz, J.I. & Piran, T. 1997, astro-ph/9712242
- ?? Kluzniak, W. & Ruderman, M. 1997, preprint (astro-ph/9712320)
- ?? Kouveliotou C., et al. 1993, ApJ, 413, L101
- ?? Krolik, J. H. & Pier, E. A. 1991, ApJ, 373, 277
- ?? Lai, D. & Shapiro, S.L. 1995, ApJ, 442, 559
- ?? Livio, M. & Truran, J. W. 1992, ApJ, 389, 695
- ?? Melrose, D.B. 1993, in *Pulsars as Physics Labs*, eds. R.D. Blandford et.al (Oxford: New York)
- ?? Meszaros, P. & Rees, M. J. 1997, ApJ, 482, L29
- ?? Metzger, M. et al. 1997, Nature, 387, 878
- ?? Michel, F.C. 1984, ApJ, 284, 384
- ?? Narayan, R., Paczynski, B., & Piran T. 1992, ApJ, 395, L83
- ?? Rees, M. J. 1997a, preprint (astro-ph/9701162)
- ?? Rees, M.J, 1997b, private communication
- ?? Rees, M.J. & Meszaros, P. 1994, ApJ, 430, L93
- ?? Rees, M.J. & Meszaros, P. 1997, preprint (astro-ph/9712252)
- ?? Rhoads, J. 1997, ApJL, 487, L1
- ?? Ruffert et. al 1997, A& A, 319 122
- ?? Thompson, C. 1994, MNRAS, 270, 480.
- ?? Usov, V.V. 1992, Nature, 357, 452
- ?? Usov, V.V. 1994, in Gamma-Ray Bursts, AIP Conference Proc. 307, (AIP: New York) p552.
- ?? Waxman, E. 1997, ApJ, 489, L33

?? Waxman, E., Kulkarni, S.R., & Frail, D.A. 1997, preprint (astro-ph/9709199).

?? Wijers, R.A.M.J, Meszaros, P. & Rees, M.J., 1997, MNRAS 288, L51.

?? Yi, I. & Blackman, E.G., 1998, ApJL, in press (astro-ph/9710149)